

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 26 are pending in the subject patent application. Claims 1 through 6, 8, 12, 18, 24, 25, and 26 have been rejected. Claims 7, 9, 10, 11, 13 through 17, and 19 through 23 have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23, and 24 have been amended to overcome the formal grounds of objection. Further, new claims 27 through 33 have been added.

Discussion of Amendments to the Claims

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite the original limitations of claim 12, which was allowable as explained below. Claim 13, which originally depended upon claim 12, has been amended to depend directly upon claim 1, so it is still allowable as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action. Since claims 14 through 17 depend either directly or indirectly upon claim 13, they are also allowable.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 23 have been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims therein, so these claims are allowable as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action. Since claims 20, 21, and 22 depend either directly or indirectly upon claim 19, they are also allowable. Claims 12 and 18 have been amended to depend upon allowable claim 23, so they are also now allowable. New claims 27 through 32 depend upon allowable claim 23, so they are also allowable.

Method claim 24 has been amended to add recitation of the step of operating a door interlock. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at page 12, lines 9 through 13, and in Figures 18 and 19 of the drawings, as well as in original apparatus claim 23, which is indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. This renders method claim 24 allowable as explained below.

New claim 33 recites the original limitations of claim 24, plus the recitation of establishing the excitation field with a permanent magnet, which renders claim 33 allowable, as explained below.

Reconsideration of the rejected claims and the amended and new claims is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the arguments below.

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Heltemes. The Examiner contends that Heltemes discloses all of the limitations recited in the claims, but the Examiner does not mention the use of a permanent magnet as an excitation source, as recited in claim 12. The Applicant respectfully points out that Heltemes fails to disclose the use of a permanent magnet as the excitation source. Therefore, original claim 12 was allowable. The limitations of claim 12 have now been incorporated into amended claim 1, rendering claim 1 allowable. Since claims 2 through 6, 8, and 13 through 17 depend either directly or indirectly upon amended claim 1, they are also allowable.

Further, the method of using a permanent magnet as the excitation source has been incorporated into new claim 33, rendering claim 33 allowable.

Claim 24 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Heltemes. However, claim 23, which recites a door interlock has been found allowable, since the known prior art does not disclose a door interlock. Therefore, use of a door interlock has been incorporated into method claim 24, rendering claim 24 allowable. Since claims 25 and 26 depend directly upon claim 24, they are also allowable.

Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Heltemes in view of Edelstein. However, claim 4 depends indirectly upon claim 1, which has been rendered allowable. Therefore, claim 4 is also now allowable.

Discussion of Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has indicated that claims 7, 9, 10, 11, 13 through 17, and 19 through 23 would be allowable, but they have been objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims. Claims 7, 9, 10, 11, and 19 through 23 have been amended to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims, and they are therefore allowable. Further, claims 13 through 17, which previously depended upon claim 1 via claim 12, have been amended to depend upon claim 1, into which the limitations of claim 12 have been incorporated, so claims 13 through 17 are now allowable.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 through 33 are patentable, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (360)599-2285 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 23rd day of January, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald W. Spinks
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,843
Customer No. 22,875

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this Response to Office Action is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on this 23rd day of January, 2006.



Gerald W. Spinks
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,843

54-60122.roa